

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION - District 4 Toll Bridge Program**

333 Burma Rd.

Oakland, CA 94607

(510) 622-5660, (510) 286-0550 fax

*Flex your power  
Be energy efficient!*

July 31, 2008

Contract No. 04-0120F4

04-SF-80-13.2 / 13.9

Self-Anchored Suspension Bridge

Letter No. 05.03.01-002466

Michael Flowers  
Project Executive  
American Bridge/Fluor, A JV  
375 Burma Road  
Oakland, CA 94607

Dear Michael Flowers,

**CCO 59 - Additional OBG Penetrations**

This letter is issued in response to ABF-CAL-LTR-000599, "CCO 59 Additional OBG Penetration," dated July 23, 2008, regarding the meeting held July 1, 2008, to discuss OBG and Tower MEP penetrations and the scope of Contract Change Order (CCO) No. 59. In the letter, the Department is asked to confirm if ABF was verbally advised that ZPMC was not to proceed with the production of CCO 59 shop drawings prior to the Department's review of ZPMC's cost estimate.

CCO 59 provides direction for approximately 180 "additional" penetrations over and above the some 760 "contract" penetrations necessary for the planned work. The Department has previously provided written authority to proceed for the additional penetrations ordered by CCO 59. The Contractor should proceed with assuring the installation of both the contractual and additional penetrations during fabrication in the most effective and efficient manner, including providing appropriate shop drawings. ABF need not submit costs or await further direction from the Department in order to proceed with the work previously authorized.

At the July 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, the Department was surprised and dismayed to learn that MEP penetrations had not been incorporated into the appropriate OBG plates, although previously an extensive effort had been undertaken by the Department to assure such penetration information was incorporated into the shop drawings. At an earlier team meeting, the Department learned from ABF's Fabrication Manager, Thomas Nilsson, who was also surprised, that the penetrations were not being installed while cutting plates on the CNC table.

Although the Contractor is obligated to identify and show the contractual penetrations on shop drawings, the Department had agreed to identify the locations of both the contractual penetrations and the additional penetrations with redline markings on the initial shop drawing submittals. This approach was adopted in the best interest of the Project to 1.) minimize detailing efforts for penetrations and 2.) expedite delivery of final shop drawings. The redlined penetrations were generally provided on the original Material Preparation (MP) or Sub-Assembly (SA) shop drawing submittals.

The Department understood from ABF that this effort would allow for the penetrations to be installed through the CNC process during the initial plate cutting. It is not clear why the approved MP and SA shop drawings with penetrations were not utilized to install penetrations. Furthermore, it is not clear why the approved MP and SA drawings, with penetrations, were not used to create the segment assembly drawings.

Several of the early segment assembly drawings (i.e. Submittal ABF-SUB-000517) were submitted showing penetration details and then, when submitted at a later date, the assembly sheets were missing the penetration details. When questioned, ABF indicated that penetration details would not be necessary on the assembly drawings as the details were already contained in the MP and SA drawings.

At the July 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, ABF suggested the penetrations must now be re-detailed on the segment assembly drawings, as the penetrations will be installed during segment assembly, and that somehow the Department is now responsible for the re-detailing for both the contractual and additional penetrations. The Department does not acknowledge responsibility for re-detailing penetrations on segment assembly drawings. It is noted, ABF has previously claimed all costs associated with the previous penetration detailing effort by CTLLC, for both contractual and additional penetrations.

At the July 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, the Department further requested assurance from ABF that, if ZPMC were to detail penetrations on assembly drawings, the penetrations would indeed be installed during segment assembly, such that no further surprises would be forthcoming. ABF could not provide such assurance; hence it is evident ABF is unaware of how ZPMC will conduct the work and therefore not clear of the need for appropriate shop drawings.

Again, ABF is obligated to manage the fabrication process in order to assure the installation of both the contractual and additional penetrations occur during fabrication in the most effective and efficient manner.

Sincerely,



GARY PURSELL  
Resident Engineer

cc: Bill Shedd, Darryl Schram  
file: 05.03.01